

REMARKS

I. Overview

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 12, 2006, and pursuant to the Office Communication mailed January 18, 2007.

Claim 1 is currently pending in this application. Claim 1 has been added. No new matter has been introduced. This present response is an earnest effort to traverse all rejections and secure the Examiner's agreement that all claims are in proper form for immediate allowance. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Specification

The Examiner first objects to the application on the basis it does not contain an abstract of the disclosure. Applicants have now added an abstract of the disclosure, thus rendering this ground of objection moot.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure on the basis it does not contain a section worded "Description of the Invention". The Examiner further notes that while the disclosure contains with cited element numbers, these have not been discussed in the specification. Applicants have now amended the application to add a "Brief Description of the Drawings", a description of the cited elements, and a "Description of the Invention", thus rendering this ground of rejection moot.

III. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings on the basis they include reference characters not mentioned in the description. Applicants are hereby submitting corrected drawing sheets, thus rendering this ground of rejection moot.

IV. Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has next objected to citation numbers 5 and 6 of the Information Disclosure Statement on the basis they are not in a legible format. This rejection is not understood, as the IDS cites all of the requisite information pertaining to the references. In the interest of expediting prosecution, however, Applicants are not resubmitting these references in a Supplemental IDS with the citations listed as they were in the International Search Report, verbatim. Thus, the citations can no longer be considered objectionable, and Applicants respectfully request that the references be considered as to their merits.

V. Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to on the basis it should be labeled as claim 1 and for improper grammar. Applicants have now amended the claim to alleviate these informal objections, thus rendering the ground of rejection moot.

VI. Issues under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard

as the invention. Applicants have now amended claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, thus rendering these rejections moot.

VII. Issues Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,853,806) in view of Japan 50-005213 ('213). While the Examiner admits that Higuchi et al. do not teach the precise amounts of zinc, magnesium, and tin to be used with Applicants' aluminum and silicon, the Examiner employs '213 for the teaching that a desirable aluminum alloy composition for improved corrosion resistance includes 2-18% silicon, 2-8% zinc, 0-2% magnesium, and 0.1-1.5% tin, citing the Abstract in support. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has now been amended to provide that its method of applying aluminum coatings on cast iron and steel products is conducted without using flux. Literal support for this amendment is found on p. 2, paragraph 1 of the specification which states that, "[t]he present invention solves the problem of decreasing the temperature of aluminum melt, at this temperature the formation of quite a plastic protective coating without using the flux is provided, which allows to deform rolled and other products with aluminum coatings." No new matter has been added.

Higuchi et al. require the application of a dry flux to their steel material in order to: (1) inhibit oxidation on the steel material surface; (2) promote cleaning and activating for the steel material surface; and (3) stably float in a coating bath. (Col. 6, lines 1-19). Applicants specifically note the disadvantages in the prior art of using fluxes in order to apply aluminum melt on cast iron and steel products at temperatures lower than 715°C. (Spec. p. 1, last

paragraph). The presently claimed invention is surprisingly able to achieve the objective of using lower temperatures to apply aluminum on cast iron and steel products without excessively high temperatures, and without the use of fluxes, both of which are potentially hazardous to human workers.


Since Higuchi et al. requires the use of fluxes in their method, said reference specifically teaches away from Applicants' claimed method. The addition of the '213 reference does not alleviate this teaching away in the prior art, and does not provide a motivation or suggestion to modify the teachings of Higuchi et al. in the manner claimed by Applicants. For these reasons, the cited prior art do not render Applicants' claimed invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicants therefore respectfully request that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

VIII. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as written are in proper form for immediate No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wendy K. Marsh', is written over the printed name and address.

WENDY K. MARSH, Reg. No. 39,705
McKEE, MOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
Phone No: (515) 288-3667
Fax No: (515) 288-1338
CUSTOMER NO: 22885

Attorneys of Record

-WKM/bjh/pw -